

OBSEVATIONS

ON A

SERMON

PREACH'D before the

CORPORATION of BRISTOL;

ON

14 Catcote (Oct 1)
K

Sunday the sixteenth Day of *August*, 1735,

BEING

The Day before the ASSIZES.

Quid dignum tanto foret hic promissor hiatu?
Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.

Horat. de arte poeticâ.

*Doubtless the Pleasure is as great
Of being cheated, as to cheat;
As Lookers on feel most Delight,
That least perceive a Juggler's Slight;
And still the less they understand,
The more th' admire the Slight of Hand.*

Hudib. Part II. Cant. 3. in the Beginning:

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. HODGES at the *Looking-Glass* on *London-Bridge*;
and J. WILSON, Bookseller, at the *Bible and Sun* near the
Horse-Shoe-Inn, in *Wine-Street*, *Bristol*. 1736.

[Price Six-Pence.]

2 4374 bb 28



3

T O T H E
R E A D E R.

WHEN the Sermon preached by Mr. Catcott, came first to my Hands, I made some few Satyrical Remarks upon it for my own private Amusement and Diversion, without any Design of publishing them to the World. I agreed with all the learned World; that there was nothing in it, which was worth an Answer, or else that it might have been answered long since. As the Author, Page 15. struts and looks big in his own borrowed Feathers, and seems to take all his Sense and Learning from an Author above all Contradiction, who first since the Inspiration ceased, began to recover the true Sense of the Hebrew Scriptures, I thought that he was a most eminent Commentator; like Bishop Patrick, Dr. Hammond, or Dr. Louth, or most eminently skilled in the Oriental Learning, like Dr. Lightfoot, Dr. Pocock, or Mr. Mede. But when I found

iv To the READER.

*in the Postscript, that this great Goliath was Mr. Hutchinson, who lives in the Meuse, near Charing-Cross, Westminster, and whose Learning and intellectual Capacities are least admired, by those who know him best; I own I was surprized. I could not think, that such Ignis fatui, could have led any Followers into Briars and Ditches, but that such fiery Meteors must have spent themselves in a Blaze, having nothing solid or substantial to support them. And as the Author only lighted his own Rush at the other's dark Lanthorn; so their Opinions would soon burn out, and come to nothing. But here I was mistaken. The Admirers of the Sermon cry it up, as the finest Piece that ever was printed. I thought it dull enough in all Conscience. They said, It was a most learned Sermon; and I was so ignorant, that I could find no Learning in it. However they tell us first, That there is Hebrew in it. But Welch or Irish might have done as well. For I find that a Smattering of any strange Language before an ignorant Auditory, from a conceited Preacher will make a learned Sermon. Secondly, they say, that it is a very extraordinary Sermon, because they themselves do not understand it; and I know not how they should. But as the Design of Speech is to be understood; so it is an extraordinary Speech indeed, where
the*

To the READER. V

the Design of Speech is lost. Or in other Words, It is an excellent Sermon, but it is good for nothing. But, lastly, they say, that it is an excellent Sermon, because it was never answered. Here the Author and his Admirers grow big, and even dare all the World to answer it. And because it had no Answer, they say, It is unanswerable. This made me think, that an Answer as little to any Purpose, as the Sermon it self, might stop the Mouths of some People, and silence that Argument. I thought of Juvenal, Sat. 1.

—— Nunquamnè reponam

Vexatus toties rauci Theseide Codri? &c.

And this made me resolve to publish something to the World. When I had taken that Resolution, I intended to have wrote in a more serious Style, but upon a Review, I found the Sermon so very ridiculous, that I could not tell how to alter my first Method. This I hope will satisfy the Reader, why the Answer comes out so late; since there was nothing in the Sermon, but what might have been answered immediately. If any thing seems too ludicrous, I hope that the Reader will excuse it, since it is impossible in a Case of this Nature to be altogether serious. And as the Author, Prov. xxvi. 5. is so very wise in his own Conceit, I could not do other-

vi To the READER.

wise with any Hope of bringing him to a right Knowledge of himself. Or if the Author thinks that any thing is too severe or grating, he must lay the Blame on himself and his Friends, who by their proud, arrogant Boasting, and bidding Defiance to all Mankind have brought it upon him.

OBSER-

OBSERVATIONS

ON A

SERMON, &c.

WHEN I first read the Title Page of the Sermon preached by the ingenious Mr. *Alexander Stopford Catcott*, I thought that the Word ELAHIM had been a Mistake of the Printer, and that the *A* had been there placed instead of an *O*; but when I found it ninety three Times used in the same Sermon, and always spelt in the same Manner, I then perceived, that it was a Mistake of my own, or (pardon the Expression) of the learned Author. The Word is used above six hundred Times in the *Old Testament*, and always written with an *O*, and since that it hath been always spelt in the same Manner (as I believe) both by *Jews* and *Christians* till now. This Author himself owns, that the Word in the singular Number is *ELOAH*, which I readily agree to; but why the *O* in the singular Number should be turned into an *A* in the Plural, is beyond my little Skill in *Hebrew* to imagine. And I always thought, that the Silence of all *Grammarians*, in this Case, was sufficient to justify the Retaining the same Vowel in both Numbers without any Alteration.

I should easily have let that pass, for which a School-Boy might have been whip'd in another Place; but the Concern, which I have for the *Divine Majesty* to rescue it from^b that execrable

^a Page 9. Line 3. ^b Page 9.

Epitbet, which is put upon it by the Author; to set the Sermon in as proper a Light as I can, though it highly deserves another Treatment; that others may understand it, who now believe it to be unintelligible; and my Desire (if I could) to prevent the Clergy of the Church of *England* from preaching such *Entbusiastick Notions*, and from distracting our selves thereby, and giving the common Enemy an Advantage over us, are the Motives of my appearing in Print at this Time, and will (as I hope) be a sufficient Apology.

I fully agree with this *Author* in the Beginning of his Sermon, that ^c *The Conciseness, Clearness, Certainty and Significancy of the Hebrew Scriptures can be known only to those, who understand the Language in which they are written.* And that *they are the Repository of all divine Knowledge*, and in nothing contrary to that which is *natural*, and that *their Excellencies shew their Author.* I will not say (as the Author doth) that *they are the Repositories of all natural Knowledge*, because there are many Propositions in *Euclid*, which I cannot demonstrate from thence, and many Particulars in *experimental Philosophy* both Terrestrial and Celestial, which they were never intended to give us any Account of. But this I may venture to add, that if the *Hebrew Language* was perfectly understood by all Divines (as I heartily wish it was) the Ignorance and Self-conceitedness of the Author might be more fully detected.

This learned Author, as I had almost called him, takes a great deal of Pains to prove that ^d the Word ELAHIM (as he spells it) is derived from the Verb *Elab* or *Alab*, which signifies *to confirm by Oath, to bind a Person, for the fulfilling of certain Terms under the Penalty of a conditional Malediction*, and he adds, that it occurs about for-

ty Times in Scripture, and always in the same Sense. This Derivation is wholly new, for no Lexicographer, which I know, takes any Notice of it.

However the *learned Author* in his own Conceit, and in Spight of them all infers from hence, • That *this may suffice to shew, that by ELAHIM are to be understood, Persons who have sworn to a Covenant, and laid themselves under a conditional Execration.* As this relates to each Person in the *Blessed Trinity*; so I cannot but think of it with Horror and Indignation, and want Words to express my Concern. But as the Observation is new; so I doubt not, but it will appear to be false. That the Noun derived from thence signifies an Oath or a Curse, and that the Verb hath the same Signification, I readily grant; but then they are always spoken of Men, and never of the *Blessed God*, tho' it is the Nature of the *Hebrew Language* for the Infinitive Moods and the Nouns frequently and elegantly to allude to the Verbs. But notwithstanding this Propriety of Speech, whenever GOD is said to swear, the Verb נִשְׁבַּח *Nishbang* is used, which implies no Malediction, because it doth not suppose a Possibility of *Breaking the Covenant*. For ¹ GOD, who is Truth it self, cannot deny himself. But when it is spoken of Men, it supposeth a Possibility of breaking it, and consequently of a Curse. For ² GOD will be true, though every Man is a Liar. Now to derive the Name of GOD from a Word, which he always avoids, when he speaks of himself, and which supposeth an Imperfection in his very Nature, is absurd in it self, and deserves a severer Epithet. What the Author adds in the next Page is hellish Blasphemy, and chills the Blood at the reading of it, ³ Who is אֱלֹהִים a Participle Passive, execrated besides JEHOVAH? The Reader may

• Page 8. ¹ 2 Tim. ii. 13. ² Rom. iii. 4. ³ Page 9.

see the Meaning of the Word in the *Latin Dictionary*, at the Participle *Execratus*. The Author cannot say, that he only meant here, *Who hath sworn to a Covenant, and laid themselves under a conditional* Execration besides JEHOVAH? since all Men who are baptized or receive the LORD's Supper, enter into Covenant with GOD under the same Penalty. Neither can he say he meant only *Who is sworn*, but JEHOVAH? because it is as equally true of all People, who take any Employment Ecclesiastical, Civil or Military, or are obliged to appear in Cases of Judicature before a Civil Magistrate. If he saith, That he hath a better Meaning, but wanted a better Word to express himself by; then as he hath kept his Meaning to himself, so he should have said nothing, until he had found out a better Word. And therefore since his own Sense of the Word cannot serve him, or be known, the Word must be taken as we find it in the Dictionary. But this can never be attributed to each Person in the *Trinity*, without supposing that each of them hath broken the conditional Covenant made, and consequently that there is an end of the Holiness, Truth, Purity and Perfection of the Divine Nature. And what a System of new Divinity this Author can raise from this Hypothesis, is easy for all the World to judge. There is no such Language as this in Heaven. There the *Cherubim* and *Seraphim* continually praise the Divine Majesty, crying 'Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God of Hosts, and * ascribe Blessing and Honour and Glory and Power unto him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. If the Author, when he comes into the other World, can preach this Doctrine to the Devils and damned Spirits, and make them believe it, it may be some Comfort to them in their Place

¹ *Isa. vi. 1, 2, 3.*

^{*} *Rev. v. 13.*

stantly kept in the Plural Number **אלהם**. And that the Letter **א** or *H* is not quiescent in this Word, and therefore cannot be derived, as this Author would have it, I think, that I have the concurrent Testimonies of all the Languages near of Kin to the Hebrew, such as ^p the Chaldee, Syriack, Samaritan and the Arabick Languages; but

^p Where the Hebrew Verbs end in **א**, the other Languages generally, but the Syriack and Arabick when derived from the Hebrew do always end in **נ**, **י**, or **ו**. The derived Verbs in the Chaldee and Samaritan, which end in **א** do always change their Letters like the Hebrew, and the Syriack and Arabick Verbs which end in **א** are regularly declined, see Beverigii Grammatica Syriaca, pag. 35. Erpenii Grammatica Arabica, lib. 2. cap. 5. pag. mihi, 63. Edit. 1620. And not one of them is (as I think) derived from the Hebrew. So that they are out of the Case, or rather make against the Author. Besides, in all these Languages the **א** in the sacred Name is moveable, and therefore it cannot be derived from the Hebrew Verb, where it is quiescent. In Chaldee it is **אלה** in the singular Number with a Mappick and **אלהם** in the Plural. Dan. ii. 47. and **אלה** in the Singular with an emphatical **נ**. Dan. 4. 2. and **אלהם** in the Plural. Jer. x. 11. In the Samaritan Language it is **אלה** with an Emphatical **א** like the **נ** in Chaldee, Gen. i. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. And it is so tenacious of that Letter, that it keeps it in Regimine, or before a Genitive Case, as in Gen. xxiv. 12. and Gen. xxvi. 24. contrary to the Nature of the Chaldee and Syriack, and it self in all other Instances. And it is **אלהם** in the Plural Number, exactly like the Hebrew, as Gen. iii. 1, 3, 9, 14, 22, 23. The Syriack is **ܐܠܗ** Aloho in the singular Number,

Gen. i. 1. and **ܐܠܗܝܡ** Alohe in the Plural. Jer. x. 11. Em-

phatical, or otherwise **ܐܠܗܝܢ** Alohin, as Dan. ii. 11. And

the Arabick hath **الله** Allaho in the Singular Number, Gen. i.

i. and **الالهات** Alalihato in the Plural. Dan. ii. 1. So that the

א is always moveable in all those Languages, and consequently none of these Words can be derived from a Verb, where the same Letter is quiescent. But in all this I submit to be corrected by the Author, whenever he shall think fit to inform me better.

this

this with Submission to the Judgment of the Author.

But to return to the *Hebrew*, the Verb *אלה* *Alah* hath no *Mappick* or *Speck* in the Middle of the last Letter. But the Noun *אלה* always hath, which makes a great Alteration in the Nature of the Verbs; as will appear to any one, who will compare the Verbs *אלה* *Alah* and *גבה* in the common *Lexicon* with the Rules of Grammar.

There is also another Blunder in this Derivation. In those *Participles Passive*, there is always a *Kametz* or a long *A* under the first Radical Letter; but this Author writes it with an *E*; and accordingly the *Plural Number* ought, under a *Guttural* to have a *Chateph Patba*, or a short *A*, and therefore if we retain the *H*, which is false *Grammar*; yet it should be *Alubim*, and not *Elabim*, as he always spells it. But when so learned a Critick is above the Rules of common *Grammar*, it is no Wonder, that he is at the same Time above the Rules of Common Sense.

However, for a farther Proof of his Derivation, this learned Author, if I may so call him, takes a great deal of Pains (but I think to no Purpose) to prove that *an Oak is called Alah*, as it was made an Emblem of the Covenant, or perhaps of one of the *Elohim themselves*. A Man of this Author's Sagacity might as easily say, that the Word *ELOHIM* was derived from *Alah* an Oak, because of its Firmness and Duration, and he could only have made himself, if possible, more ridiculous.

However the Author labours hard to prove the Resemblance between *ELOHIM* and an Oak, from the *Etymology* of the Word. And among many other Things he saith, *That the Patriarchs under or near this Tree had settled Places of Worship. The*

Heathens also had their Oaks, and the Oak became sacred to all Nations. He might have added with a Parity of Reason, That all their Religion consisted in Swearing, because *אלה* *Alah* signifies an Oath, or that it all consisted in Cursing, because *אלה* signifies a Curse.

But as our Author is such a Grammatical Man; so he cannot but know, that in all Languages there are certain *Themes* or radical Words, and it is most impertinent to derive them from others without very good Authority. I shall instance but in one out of *Latin*, and another out of the *Greek*, tho' as many thousand might be added. The Word *Θεός* or *God* in *Greek* is owned by all *Lexicographers* to be a Theme. However, there are some, who derive it, as if it was from *θεω* *to place*, because the Providence of GOD orders all Things, or from *θεω* *to run*, because it passeth through all Things, or from *θεω* *to behold*, because GOD sees all Things. And I wonder that a Man of Mr. Catcott's Sagacity, when he derives the sacred Name of GOD in *Hebrew* from a Verb, which signifies *to Swear* and *to Curse*; had not confirmed it from the *Greek*, by affirming, that the Word *Θεός* *God*, and *Θεῖον* *Divine* were derived from the Word *Θεός*, which signifies *Brimstone*, and quoted *Gen. xix. 24.* as it is in the *Septuagint*, with other Texts for his Purpose.

In *Latin* the Word *Deus* or *Deo* in the *Dative Case* is allowed to be a Theme; but if this critical Author had derived it from *Duo*, which signifies *Two*, and have brought an Argument to prove from thence *The supreme and inferior ELAHIM*, which is his running Title in every Page, it had been more to the Purpose, than any thing, which I find in his Sermon. Perhaps this learned Author hath been so taken up in the *Oriental Studies*, that he hath almost forgot his *Greek* and *Latin*;
or

or else his mere natural Ingenuity could have helped him to such Observations as these. Or perhaps the Author is under such a judicial Infatuation to Mr. *Hutchinson*, that he cannot stir an Inch without him, and therefore not finding them in his great Original he could not insert them. However, if so, I hope, that in Time he may learn to go alone.

But to return to the *Hebrew*: When the *Author* used that daring Expression, ' *Who is execrated but JEHOVAH?* ' it is as strange, that he had not also derived the Word *ELAHIM* from *Alah*, which in *Chaldee* and *Syriack* signifies to lament and bowl, and hath no other Interpretation; especially since his own Verb, is used in ' the *Hebrew Bible* in the same Sense.

However I take the Word *ELOHIM* to be derived from the *Arabick* Verb *أَلَى* *Alaba*, which signifies to worship religiously, and that it is ' a Participle of the Passive Voice, and signifies that Being, who alone is religiously to be worshipped. In *Arabick* the Verb *أَلَى* with all others, which end in the Letter *ن* or *H*, are always declined regularly, which is the Reason, why the said Letter is always kept in this Word in all the *Oriental Languages*, and especially in the *Hebrew*, contrary to its constant Method in other Cases. Now in ' *Arabick* there is a Participle in the Form of *Pekoud*, which in *Hebrew* may be written either with a long *O* or a long *U*, and is sometimes taken actively, but most commonly passively. Any one may be satisfied of this by looking into the * *Polyglott Lexicon*. And therefore if

* Page 9. * *Joel* i. 8. * *Castelli Lexicon Polyglottum*, p. 120. * *Chappellow's Elementa Arabica*, pag. 20. *Erpenii Elementa Arabica*, lib. 2. cap. 2. in fine, pag. mihi, 55. * *Ut in literâ (u.)*

we must retain the original Sense of the Word in that Text, which the Author so miserably wrests, it will be thus. *Who is a God religiously to be worshipped, but JEHOVAH?* This is like the first Commandment, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but me*, and agrees with ^y the Text in the *Old Testament*, which CHRIST confirmed in the *New*, *Thou shalt worship the LORD thy GOD, and him only shalt thou serve*. This gives us a far more noble Idea of the *Divine Majesty*, and I hope, that the Reader will give it the Preference before the other.

If any one shall ask, What the *Arabick Language* hath to do with the *Hebrew*? I shall crave leave to answer, That there are a vast Number of Words in the *Hebrew Language*, which are derived from the other. And for the Proof hereof I shall go no farther than the two first Verses of *Genesis*. Here, besides the Word in Dispute, the *Hebrew Word* ^a שָׁמַיִם *Heavens* is derived from the Verb שָׁמַל *Samà* quiescent in , or י which signifies *to be above us*. And ^a the Word רָצוֹן is derived from the Verb אָרַץ *Arada*, which signifies *to be beneath us*, so that both comprehend the universal Frame of the World. In *Verse 2.* the Word ^b תָּוֹרֵם *without Form*, comes from the *Arabick Verb* تَهَا *Tabà* quiescent in , or י which signifies *to be neglected, or uncultivated*. And the Word ^c בֹּהֶם *Void*, comes from the *Arabick Verb* بَهَا *Baba*, quiescent like the other; which signifies *to be empty*, but none of these have any Derivation in the *He-*

^y *Deut. vi. 13. Deut. x. 20. and Matt. iv. 10.* ^a *Castelli Lexicon Polyglottum, pag. 2553 & 2554.* ^a *Ibid. 235. & 236.* ^b *Pocockii Notæ Miscellanæ, pag. 35.* ^c *Castelli Lexicon Polyglottum, pag. 290.*

brew Language. I suppose, that the Reader will not expect, that I should go through the whole Hebrew Bible for this Purpose. All this may be found in the Works of ^d the learned Dr. Pocock, who is allowed to have understood all these Oriental Languages, the best of any Man in Europe, except this Author.

I shall give one Example more of this Author's excellent Skill in Etymology in the Word *Cberubim*. He tells us, ^e *It hath been a Notion almost universally received, that the Cherubim were created Spirits*. There is no Doubt of this. But then he adds, *For which there is not one Word of Proof in the Scripture*. The Jews own that by ^f *all the Host of Heavens are meant* all their several Orders, of which the ^h *Cberubim* and *Seraphim* were some, and that they were created on the second Day. And I believe no Christian can confute it. If I understand his mystical Way of writing (which I doubt) then the *Cberubim* were uncreated, and consequently GOD himself. If I could depend on his own Derivation, I should desire no more to confute his Assertion. He saith ⁱ *they were named Cherubim, a Word compounded of 7 Cbe, quasi, a Note of Likeness, and Rubim, the great ones, great in every Respect, and in the highest Degree*. And therefore he adds, ^k *that CHRIST, and he only in Propriety when on Earth was called Rubbi or Rabbi, my great One*. Now every like is not the same. If the Trinity should say, ^l *Behold, the Man is become like one of us*, this will not prove that he was one of them. Or if I should say, that Mr. Catcott's Writings are like

^d Pocockii Notæ Miscellanæ, pag. 34. & 35. ^e Page 12.
^f Cherubim angelos esse nemo dubitat, inquit Ludovicus de Dieu, Poli Synopsis in Gen. iii. 24. ^g Gen. ii. 1. ^h Targ. Jonathanis in Gen. i. 26. ⁱ Page 12, 13, 14. ^k Page 14. ^l Gen. iii. 22.

the Writings of a Heretick ; he will not allow that this will prove him to be so without better Arguments. It perplexes me to know what he means, and I can find out no better Description of the *Cberubim* from his Words, than that it is an *un-created Emblem of the Trinity in Unity by three Heads and four Visages, two joined together to signify the Divine and human Nature of Christ, and all these four Bodies joined in one, with their Faces turned to each other.* This is such a Jargon, that as I cannot understand it ; so I cannot confute it. But (I think) I may challenge any Man in *Bedlam* to exceed our Author in the common Way of Writing. However I shall borrow his own Sentence. ^m *There is not one Word of Proof* for what he saith in Scripture. If by his *uncreated Emblem of the Trinity* he means the Trinity it self, then he makes Absurdities to flow from our excellent *Te Deum*, that I know not how he can join in it ; as if the *Cberubim* these *three Persons* did worship and adore each other in the same Manner, and upon the same Level, as the *Angels*, the *Heavens* and *all the Powers therein* do worship them. If by *Cberubim* he means CHRIST JESUS ⁿ, a Type of whom he saith is by *Ezekiel*, xxviii. 14. stiled an *anointed Cherub*, then his deriving the Name to signify *like the great ones*, or *in the Similitude of the great ones*, is direct *Arianism*, who owned the Son of GOD to be *ὁμοῖοι* ^o of like Substance, but denied him to be *ὁμοῖοι* ^o of one and the same Substance with the Father. And then the Meaning of our *Te Deum* will be this, That the *Cberubim* or CHRIST worships the other Persons in the same Manner and Order as the other Angels do, which is contrary to the Words of St. Paul, who ^o places him far above

^m Page 12.ⁿ Page 14.^o *Ephes.* i. 20, 21, 22, 23.

them

them all. The Reader by looking into the Sermon more at large, may guess if these Inferences are natural or no, and if he doth not, I submit, I do not believe, that the Author intended them; and I can charge him with nothing, because I know nothing of what he drives at. But this is the natural Consequence of writing so unintelligibly, that as some will commend him they know not why, so others will find Faults, and draw Inferences for the same Reason.

But to let all pass, and come to the Derivation of the Word *Cberubim*. The Author derives it from *Cbe*, a Note of Likeness, and *Rubim*, which he saith, comes from the Verb *רבב* *Rabab*, and therefore he saith, that CHRIST, and be only in Propriety, when on Earth was called Rubbi, or Rabbi, my great One. *Rubbi* is in Hebrew, my Multitude or my greater Part; and that it was a Title of CHRIST I knew not before. But beside that Blunder, here is so much false Hebrew, that I blush for the Author's Sake. First, If we look into the Hebrew Grammar, we shall find that there is never a long *U* expressed by the Letter *ו* in any of those Verbs, which double the last Letter, as it is always in the Word *Cberubim*, but it is the Characteristick Difference between them, and such Verbs, whose middle Letter is *ו* or *U*. But let that pass. Secondly, Whenever these Verbs have an *י* or *O*, the two last Letters are preserved intire, but here is one left out. And, Lastly, where *ו* Letters are added in the End of a Word, as *IM* in *Cberubim*, there is alway a *Dagesh* or Speck, if the Letter will

² Page 12, 13, 14. ³ Page 14. ⁴ Bythneri Grammatica Hebraica, Reg. 70, 71, 72. ⁵ *Ib.* Reg. 58, ad 64. Compare these Rules with the former. ⁶ As in the Conjugations *Pihel*, *Puhel* and *Hithpahel*, Reg. 72. ⁷ Reg. 165.

admit

admit of it, to shew; that the Letter is doubled, and then the Letter *l* is left out, and the long Vowel is changed into a short one. But it is otherwise by his Derivation in both Particulars; so that here are two Faults more. Now to have four Blunders in one Derivation may very well pass off before an ignorant Auditory; but it doth not look so well, when it appears to the World in Print. If this Reverend Author doth not understand the *Latin* and *Greek* Grammars better than he doth the *Hebrew*, in which Language he pretends to be so great a Critick, or doth not teach them with a greater Exactness, it is impossible, that the Scholars should understand either of the Languages, or even to spell true *Englisb*, unless they remove to another School, or return again to an *Englisb* Master.

However, for this Author's Satisfaction, I crave leave to inform him, that the Word *Cberubim*, like *ELOHIM*, as before, hath the Form of a Participle in the *Arabick* Language, and therefore from thence we must fetch the Meaning of it. The Verb ^x signifies *to be near unto*, or *at a little Distance*. And therefore the Word *Cberubim* if taken actively, will signify ^y Angels, *who approach near the Divine Majesty*, and attend upon it; or if passively, as is most usual, ^z such *who are placed near it*; and so it perfectly agrees with their Position ^a in the Tabernacle, ^b in

^x Castelli Lexicon Polyglottum, pag. 1797, in *ܥܒܪܐ* *Caraba*. Num. 6. *This is like the Hebrew Verb, ܥܒܪ ܩܪܒ. Quarab.* For Literæ ejusdem instrumenti sæpe inter se commutantur, Bythneri Grammatica Hebraica, Reg. 1. ^y Divinæ majestati appropinquant. ^z Propè divinam majestatem positi. ^a *Exod. xxv. 17 to 23. Exod. xxxvii. 6, 7, 8, 9.* ^b *1 Kings vi. 23 to 29. 2 Chron. iii. 10 to 14.*

the Temple, ^c in *Ezechieel's Visions* and ^d in such Places of *Scripture*, where GOD is said to *ride upon them*, or to *sit between them*; all which will sufficiently confirm the Derivation. The *Oriental Languages* do all abhor Compositions of Words contrary to the Nature of *Greek* and *Latin*. And if a Man was allowed to criticize in such a Manner without any Reason, he might as well say, that the Author's Name *Stopford* was taken from a *Ditcher* in the Country, and his Name *Catcott* from a *Cat* in a *Cottage*. But I do not love to be so impertinent.

I now proceed to the *Author's* excellent Skill in *Phraseology*. We often read in *Scripture* concerning making a *Covenant*. The *Author* tells us^e, what is thus translated, should be rendered, *To cut off a Purifier*. This Observation so tickles the *Author's* Fancy, that he refers to it in sixteen other Places of his Sermon. To prove this he tells us, that the Verb כָּרַת *Carath* hath never any other Signification but *to cut*, or *to cut off*. This may be allowed, when it is not joined with the Word בְּרִית *Berith* or *Covenant*, but not then. In *Latin* the Verb *Ferio* or *Ico* signifies *to strike* or *smite*. But yet we find in *Cicero*, *Ferire fœdus*, or *Icere fœdus*, in *English*, *to make a Covenant*. The Verb *Pango* signifies *to fasten* or *drive in*, also *to plant* or *to set*, and yet *Pangere inducias* in *Livy* signifies *to agree upon*, or *make a Truce*. But to say that *Ferio* or *Ico* or *Pango* must have the same Signification here, as it hath in all other Places would be ridiculous, and not fit for a Master of a *Grammatical School*. We say in *English*, a

^c Ezek. i. 5 to 15. iii. 23. x. xliii. 3. ^d Psal. xviii. 10.
Exod. xxv. 22. 1 Sam. iv. 4. 2 Sam. vi. 2. 2 Kings xix. 15.
1 Chron. xiii. 6. Psal. lxxx. 1. xcix. 1. and Isa. xxxvii. 6.
^e Page 15.

Man *fell* a Dancing, Singing or Laughing, &c. But this will not prove, that the Word *fall* hath the same Meaning, as in other Places. If so, then when we say of Fighting, Men *fell together by the Ears*, this must prove, that they all tumbled down together, and that their *Ears* were more affected than the other Parts of their Bodies. If we must keep to the literal Sense in all such Cases, then if a Scholar should translate the *English* to *get upon a Horse*, into *Latin*, by *Gignere super equum*, I am sure, that the *Master* would have no Cause to be angry, and the *Scholar* might plead an unexceptionable Example for his Vindication.

As the Author takes the Liberty of altering Vowels, omitting one of the double Consonants, and putting any Sense upon an ambiguous Word; so I have translated a little *English* into *Latin* with the same Propriety and Exactness, as he translates *Hebrew* into *English*; and it stands thus.

Q. *How dost thou do?*

A. As well as you.

Q. *Quomodo pulvis tu fac?*

R. *Asinus fons asinus vos.*

Our Author tells us, that the Word *ברית* *Be-ritb*, which is rendered a *Covenant*, always conveys the Idea of Purification, because it comes from the Root *Bar* or *Barar*, which signifies to purify, as an Author hath proved beyond all Contradiction. Here I must crave leave to contradict him. Our *Lexicons* do all derive it otherwise. And there is this Reason for it. That in all * Words of this Sort, where a *Dagesh*, or a doubling of the Letter ought to be, and the Letter (as particular-

* Page 15.

* Bythneri Grammatica Hebraica. Reg. 19.

ly the *R* in the *Hebrew* will not bear to be doubled) the Omission is made amends for by a long Vowel. But here instead thereof we have a *Sheva* or the shortest Vowel of all, in every Place of the *Hebrew* Bible, where the Word is used.

However omitting this (for we must not stand upon small Matters) let us suppose the Word to be thus derived; yet I should have a strong Inclination to take it for a Noun, and we have many of that Form, or if for an Adjective or Participle, and then the Vowels will bias me to think ^h that the Formation was derived from the *Chaldee* or the *Syriack*, in both which Languages there is a Participle Passive of the same Nature.

Our Author tells us, that ⁱ *our Redeemer* hath many Titles where the Letter *Yod* is inserted in the third Place. Two of his own Examples are passive, and he might have ^{*} added several more. But I do not insist on this, because there are Instances to the contrary. I only say that there are ⁱ other Words in *Hebrew*, which end in *ith* derived from Verbs, which double the last Letter, like the Word in Question, and yet not one of them hath an active Signification. And I should therefore suspect our Author to be in the Wrong, because he hath not one Rule in Grammar, or one Example either in Scripture, or in the *Oriental* Languages, which is nearest of Kin to the *Hebrew* to justify his active Signification. And then the Phrase will not signify, *to cut off a Purifier*, but *to cut off the Purified*.

^h Bythneri Grammatica Chaldaica. Reg. 23. pag. 41. Be-
verigii Grammatica Syriaca, pag. 41. in utrisque ad formam
פָּקֵד. ⁱ Page 16. ^{*} As בָּחִיר electus יָדִיד dilectus,
יָחִיד unigenitus, and נָזַר Nazareus vel separatus. ⁱ גִּזְזִית
Lapis politus a גָּז totondit. Et כְּתִית Tufum a כְּתָת
tudit.

But the merriest Jest of all is, that this Author deriving the Word *ברית* *Berith* or *Covenant* from a Verb, which may justly be questioned, gives us another Word *בִּרְיָה* *Borith* exactly with the same Consonants, which he derives from his own Verb. This Derivation may be allowed him, because he agrees with the *Lexicons*. And ^m the long Vowel in the first Syllable will justify it. But this Word, as ⁿ he rightly observes, signifies *Soap*. To that he lays down this Position, That the Words in our *Bible* to *make a Covenant*, should be translated *to cut off the Purifier*, and proves as well as it can be proved, that it should be translated *to cut off Soap*.

Risum teneatis, amici?

I shall give another Instance of this Author's wretched perverting of the *Hebrew Text*°, viz. *Gen. iii. 24*. This in our Translation is *GOD placed the Cherubims*, and we have every Translation in the *Polyglott Bible* to justify it. This Author translates it, *He will inhabit the Cherubim*. To force it into this Interpretation, he first leaves out the Conjunction *ו*, which changes ^p the Future Tense into the Preterimperfect, and then he alters the Verb to bring it into a different Meaning. The Reader must know, ^q that in the *Hebrew* there are two Conjugations *Kal* and *Hipbil*; one signifies the *Action*, and the other to *cause the Action*, and they are sometimes distinguished only by the Vowels, as in *Latin*, *Fugere* and *Fugare*. Thus the Verb in the Text in one Conjugation signifies *to inhabit*, and in the other *to cause to in-*

^m Bythneri Grammatica Hebraica. Reg. 19. ⁿ Pag. 15 and 16. ^o Page 14. ^p Bythneri Grammatica Hebraica, Reg. 79. ^q Bythneri Grammatica Hebraica. Reg. 43 & 46. *habit*,

habit, to settle in a certain Place, or to place. Now the Author's Alteration of Vowels, and leaving out a Consonant at the same Time to serve a Turn is abominable, and may wrest a thousand other Texts of Scripture to a different Meaning. His Translation is this. So GOD drove out the Man, and he will inhabit the Cherubims at the East End of the Garden of Eden. Thus if I understand Sense, the Scripture is turned into Nonsense, that it might be all of a Piece with the Author's Sermon. But as the Conjunction *I* or *And*, with the Vowel under it, as it is here, always alters the Future Tense to the other, and is placed before both the Verbs in the Text; so he cannot render it *He will inhabit*, but for the same Reason he must translate the Beginning of the Verse, *And he will drive out the Man.*

Ex surdo concessio mille sequuntur.

It is high Time to leave off discoursing about Words, and come, if we can to the Sense of the Sermon. This he calls *The Cause, which he is defending.* What that Cause is, I cannot imagine, and therefore I can say nothing about it; but to *defend it* supposeth an Opposition. If others are as ignorant as my self, I am sure, that he can have none at all. Perhaps he was affrighted at some Scarecrow in the Garden, which he took to be a Giant, and this made him look about him in so furious a Manner. I doubt, that the poor Man is troubled with the Vapours, and overgrown with Melancholy, and perhaps is all this while fighting with his own Shadow, and imagines every

Mole-hill to be as big as a Mountain. This Lunacy, if not timely prevented, may turn to Distraction. A few Doses of *Hellebore* would be better than many Arguments, and then he might know, that there was not so great a Necessity to be upon the defensive Part.

He farther adds ^a, *I cannot produce the hundredth Part of the Evidence for that Side of the Cause, I am defending.* It is Pity, but that he did print an hundred Times as much, as he hath already, and then he might perhaps faintly drive the World before him, or at least the World might apprehend what he would be at, and might at last have enough of him.

However, I shall give a Specimen, of what I think I understand. He saith ^b, that *there are innumerable Places of Scripture, where JEHOVAH ELOHIM is used, which Words our Translation still renders LORD GOD, nothing to the Meaning of the Hebrew.* To justify our Translators in this, I shall affirm, that they copied from the best Translator in the World, I mean *Our Blessed Saviour* himself. These two Words are used, *Deut. vi. 4.* And he, *Mark xii. 29.* translates the whole Verse thus, *Hear, O Israel, the LORD our GOD is one LORD.* So that the Author must accuse or excuse both, as he pleaseth, for they stand or fall together. However, according to him we shall have very little of GOD or the LORD in the *Old Testament.* I remember at present but ^c one Word more in *Hebrew*, by which GOD is commonly expressed, which I find not, till I come to *Gen. xiv. 18.* so that till then we have nothing at all of this Matter, and this may be destroyed

^a Page 16.^b Page 9.^c אל

by a Paraphrase, as certainly as the other two. The Author would have the * Words to be thus rendered, *The Essence existing with Powers, the Persons bound in a Covenant.* Such a Translation will swell our *Bible* rarely, if we take the same Liberty in other Words, as well as these. But all this may be literally true of any three Men armed, who are in League together for any Mischief; and what a Notion this would convey into the Minds of the Vulgar, for whose Benefit the *Bible* was translated, let others imagine. I know, that Men are too apt to be Atheistical in this Age, without any such Paraphrase on the *sacred Names*.

I shall translate one Text, according to our Author's Scheme, which is *Deut. v. 2. The LORD our GOD made a Covenant with us in Horeb.* This, I think, is very clear and plain. But since, as he saith, this is nothing to the Meaning of the Original, according to him it must be thus. *The Essence existing with Powers, our Persons bound in a Covenant, cut off a Purifier with us in Horeb.* Now if any Man in *England* can make Sense of this, I shall submit to his Judgment.

The Author tells us † that *Philo Judeus* was the first, who asserted, that the Cherubim were created Powers. I suppose, that it was the settled Opinion from the Time, when the *Cberubims* were first painted or carved, and that was when the *Israelites* were in the Wilderness, and that the Regard which they had to the second Commandment would otherwise have prevented the Making of them. And had they been uncreated, *Moses*, who declares his Opinion, *Deut. iv. 12 to 19.* would have prevented any Similitude of

* Page 9. † Page 12.

them. I suppose, that it was the Opinion of *Moses*, when he wrote the *Pentateuch*, and that it may be proved from his own Writings. Nay, I suppose, that it was the Opinion of *Adam*, though we have no Books of that Antiquity to prove it by. However he adds, that *Philo* was the first Perverter by his *Allegories* of the Hebrew Scriptures, and was the common Parent of all Heresies. Had the Author ever read *Philo Judæus*, he would not have said so. For *Philo*² tells us, that the Therapeutæ or Essenes employed themselves in the Scriptures, by searching out of Allegories, and believed, that the Secrets of Nature to be explained by probable Conjectures did there lie hid under plainer Expressions. And he adds, that they had many Commentaries of their own, and the Authors of this Set left many Volumes of such Allegories to their Followers, and that the later Writers accustomed themselves to the Imitation of their Ancestors. *Philo* lived at the Destruction of Jerusalem. That he turned many Scriptures into Allegories, or copied from others I grant, and have no Intention to vindicate him in it. But Parables and Allegories were the Custom of those Times, particularly in the School of *Gamaliel*, and before that (as I believe) in the Schools of *Hillel* and *Shammai*. *St. Paul*, who³ became to the Jews as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews, and did it for the Gospel's sake, and very well knew their Methods, ^b allegorizes on the Story of *Isaiab* and *Isbmael* in the Epistle to the *Galatians*, written thirteen Years before the Destruction of Jerusalem. And had not this been the constant Method of the Jews, *St. Paul's*

² De vitâ contemplativâ.
iv. 19 to the End.

³ 1 Cor. ix. 20, 23.

^b Gal.

Writing in that Way would rather have been an Offence, than done any Service.

But that *Philo Judæus* was the common Parent of all Heresies, I must deny. The Sadducees were long before, and I think, that they were heretical, and that among their other Opinions, they denied that * the *Cberubims* were either Angels or Spirits. *Philo* had excellent Notions of the Trinity, and the Divinity of the *AdyG* or CHRIST. And it hath been sufficiently and at large proved by † a Right Reverend and Learned Prelate, that *Plato*, who lived almost four hundred Years before CHRIST, took formerly his Notions of these things from the Jews. Now as most of the antient Heresies were either concerning the Trinity in general, or one Person in particular; so it is hard to censure him as the common Parent of all the Heresies, which were against his own Opinion.

Philo Judæus speaks so excellently of † one GOD and his two Powers about him, one of which he calls GOD, and the others LORD, that I cannot but conjecture, that the Author's Original had stolen his Notion of † the Essence existing with Powers from *Philo* himself. But I suppose, the Author knew not how like the one was to the other; for if he had, he would not have called either of them the common Parent of all Heresies.

This learned Author, if I may so call him, gives us ‡ a new Account of the Prophet Eze-

* *Acts* xxiii. 8. † Bishop Kidder's Demonstration of the Messiah, Part 3. pag. 93 to 129. ‡ *Philo Judæus de Allegoriis, lib. 2. pag. 86. Philo de Sacrificiis Abeli & Caini, pag. 108. Philo de plantatione Noe, pag. 176. Philo quod Deus est immutabilis, pag. 244. Philo de Abrahamo, pag. 287. and Philo de victimis offerendis, pag. 661. § Page 9. ¶ Page 13.*

hies Vision of the Divine Glory in these Words; *There were the Heads of the Bull, of the Man and of the Lion together, and of the Eagle; so that there were three Heads and four Visages. The Bodies were all joined in one; by this signifying the Unity of the Essence, and the Distinction of the Persons; and Man taken into the Essence by his personal Union with the second Person, whose constant Emblem was the Lion.* The Unity of the Divine Essence, the Distinction of the Persons, and the Incarnation of the Son of GOD I fully own. I only deny, that he here gives us any Proof of it. He quotes *Ezek. Chap. xi.* where I find five and twenty Persons, *Verse 1.* but nothing else to his Purpose. He also quotes *Chap. xli.* where I find nothing at all either in our Translation or in the Original. It would reflect much on the Author's Judgment, if it could be proved, that he stole this from another, whom he was obliged to follow without any Examination of the Texts quoted, and in this Case to let the Errors of the Printer stand for his own. But I do not charge him with it.

He also quotes *Chap. x.* where I find, *Verse 14.* *Every one had four faces* (or *וְכָל־אֶחָד־מֵהֶם לְפָנִים אַרְבָּעָה* this one Vision had four Faces on the four Sides. That is in particular) *The first Face was the Face of a Cherub, or an Ox. Chap. i. 10. and the second Face was the Face of a Man, and the third the Face of a Lion, and the fourth the Face of an Eagle.* Here is not the least Mention, that the Man and the Lion were joined together, or that the four Bodies were joined all in one, but they are all spoken of as distinct from each other. Now here the Author leaves out *Verse 9.* because it directly confutes him. *And when I looked, behold the four Wheels by the Cherubims, one Wheel*

Wheel by one Cherub; and another Wheel by another Cherub. So that they were four distinct Animals, as certainly as there were four distinct Wheels. This refers us to the Vision, which the ^h Prophet saw at the River *Gheber*, and which he frequently mentions at other Times, but which our Author judiciously leaves out, because it overthrows all his Notion at once. There it is expressly said, ^k *that there were the Likeness of four living Creatures.* If so; then they were not only three; neither were their Bodies all joined in one. Then it follows, ^l *that as for the Likeness of their Faces, they the first of the four had the Face of a Man; and the second the Face of a Lion on the right Side; and they, the third of the four had the Face of an Ox on the left Side, and the fourth also had the Face of an Eagle.* This is such a literal Exposition, as the Nature of the Hebrew Language will well bear; but I think it needless to enlarge upon it, because most of our Commentators have done it already. Now to twist, and turn, and perplex a Text in the Method of our Author brings all into Confusion. To make those three, which the *Scripture* expressly mentions as four; and to join those four into one, which the *Scripture* mentions as distinct, and to whom it appoints their different Stations, is unaccountable; and though it is mentioned to prove a true Doctrine, yet it doth only serve to give the Enemy thereof a greater Advantage, as if we wanted better Arguments to support it.

Some have compared these four Animals to the four *Evangelists*, particularly St. *Matthew* to the *Man*; St. *Mark* to the *Lion*; St. *Luke*

^h Ezek. i. 1, 3, 5, 6, 10. ⁱ Ezek. iii. 23. and x. 14.
^j 15. and 23. and xlii. 2, 3. ^k Ezek. i. 5. ^l Ezek.
 i. 10.

to the Ox, and St. *John* to the *Eagle*; which shews, that they thought them to be distinct from each other. But the learned Mr. *Joseph Mede* (to whose Judgment I submit) tells us, ^m that these Visions of *Ezekiel* did allude to the ^a Tabernacle and Encampment in the Wilderness. And accordingly at the *East-side* there was the Standard of *Judab* with a *Lion*; on the *West* the Standard of *Ephraim* with an *Ox*; on the *South* the Standard of *Reuben* with a *Man*, and on the *North* the Standard of *Dan* with an *Eagle*. And as *Ezekiel* beheld the same with his Face toward the *North*; so they all appeared to him in the same Situation, the *Man* before him toward the *South*, the *Lion* on the Right-hand toward the *East*, the *Ox* on the Left-hand toward the *West*, and consequently the *Eagle* toward the *North*. After this he proves, that ^o the Scene of St. *John's* *Apocalyptick* Visions was the same with those of this Prophet, and the Encampment in the Wilderness, and he quotes *Aben Ezra*, and two other *Jewish* Commentators to shew, that they constantly agreed in the same Scene of Vision. And this he mentions as the first Key to understand that difficult Prophecy. In Consequence to this he shews, that ^p the first Animal, which he saw like a *Lion* in the *East*, was fulfilled at the Opening of ^q the *first Seal* by our SAVIOUR in the *East*. The ^r second Animal, which he saw like an *Ox* in the *West*, was fulfilled at the Opening of the ^s second Seal by *Trajan* from *Spain* or the *West*. The ^t third Animal, which he saw like a *Man* in the *South*

^m *Mede's Works*, pag. 437 to 447. ^a *Num.* Chap. ii. throughout. ^o *Rev.* Chap. iv. throughout. ^p *Rev.* iv. 7.
^q *Rev.* vi. 1, 2. ^r *Rev.* iv. 7. ^s *Rev.* vi. 3, 4. ^t *Rev.* iv. 7.

was fulfilled at the Opening of " the third Seal by *Septimius Severus*, from *Africa* or the *South*. And * the fourth *Animal*, which he saw like an *Eagle* in the *North*, was fulfilled at the Opening of the fourth Seal by *Maximinus*, who came from *Thrace* or the *North*. Accordingly the History exactly agrees with the Prophecy and the Prophetick Representations, and this is the Foundation on which he builds all the rest of his *Chronological* Observations. As therefore the Encampment in the Wilderness by GOD's Direction sixteen hundred Years before, and *Ezekiel's* Visions seven hundred Years before did so exactly agree with *St. John's* Vision and the Accomplishment thereof, it is an Argument of the Omniscieny of GOD, and * the *Apostle* saith, *Known unto him are all his Works from the Beginning of the World*. However I shall leave the Reader to his own Judgment. All that I shall say of it is, that it is rational and ingenious, and if the Foundation, on which it is built, is rightly laid, then *Mr. Catcott* is intirely wrong, or as we say in *Latin*, *Toto calq erravit*.

The Author adds, * *From the Insertion of the Jod in the third Place of all the Redeemer's Titles, as such is signified, that as he was such, all his Actions had their full Effect*. So he was *Mashich* the Anointed, that we might be so too. *Berith* the Purifier (or rather Purified, being a Passive like the rest) by Virtue of whose Cleanness our Pollutions might be wash'd away. *Tsadik* the just One, whose Righteousness should make up our Deficiencies. *David* the beloved. *Chasid* the pious One, &c. This I readily grant, and own it to

* *Rev.* vi. 5, 6. * *Rev.* iv. 7. * *Rev.* vi. 7, 8.
 † *Acts* xv. 18. * *Page* 16.

be an ingenious Observation, and congratulate the Author upon it, if it is his own. But it is so unlike the rest of the Sermon, that I suspect he stole it from some other Author, though I cannot tell from whom.

This learned Author (I wish I do not mistake him) speaks of another, of whom he saith, ^b that he was the first, who since Inspiration ceased, began to recover the true Sense of the Hebrew Scriptures, and ^c that they two were personally acquainted. Great Wits agree together; but if they are in the Right, then all the *Fathers*, all our *Reformers*, all our *Commentators*, and all our *Divines*, who were so eminently skilled in the *Oriental Languages* have done nothing, nothing at all in Comparison of the first Author's Writings, and the second Author's Sermon. All the Libraries may be burnt, for we can well spare them. All our Studies are but waste Paper. The *Scriptures* and these two Authors alone are sufficient. And to set the World an Example, he may begin with his own Books, and commit them to the Flames, for I find, he can do no Good with them, and I suppose by this, that he doth not mind them. The first must be *Robin Hood*, if the second can be but his *Little Man John*; or if I must be so romantick as these, and go farther for a Similitude, let the Original be *Don Quixot*, and the Copier be his trusty *Squire Sancho Pancho*.

For a Conclusion, the second tells us, that ^d it will cost some Pains to apprehend fully the Strength of Arguments, and Propriety of Expressions in the Original. Perhaps they may be like *Jacob Behmen's* Works, the *Cobler in Germany*, and for the bet-

^b Page 15.^c Page 37.^d Ibid.

ter Understanding of one, I should advise the Reader always to peruse them both together; for I suppose, that one will be a Key to the other. It will cost some Pains to understand them, for I have taken some Pains about the Sermon, and yet I confess, that I do not understand it. But what Reward will be met with for so much Labour I cannot determine. I have met with so little in the Sermon, that I think, I shall not trouble my self with other Writings of the same Kind. But others may find more, and as ^{more} are printed on this Occasion, they may have an ample Catalogue at last. The Author concludes, *that he doth not stand single in his Judgment in these Matters.* This I shall not deny. *Stultorum plena sunt omnia.* George Fox, who was a Journeyman to a Shoemaker, and could not write a Sentence of true *English*, as appears by his Will in *Dodsons Commons*, had a great many Followers. *Lodowick Muggleton* had the same, and some of both continue to this Day. And *Oliver's Porter* had a numerous Auditory from his Apartments in *Bedlam*, who very devoutly heard him in *Moar-Fields*. The Truth of the Case seems to be this. The *Original* and the *Copier* are both Madmen in my Opinion. However they agree most lovingly, and would fain persuade the World, that there are others as mad as they.

And now to draw toward a Conclusion. I shall advise this Reverend Schoolmaster never to correct his Boys for any Fault relating to their Learning. This must create a good Understanding between him and them, and in such a Case he cannot fail of a numerous School, provided the Parents are but as willing as their Children.

Ninety three Faults in repeating the same Word, and sixteen Faults in Misunderstanding or Misrepresenting the same Phrase, may well be excused. *Humanum est errare* may be learned from his own Example. When he whips another, let him but consider, how much he himself hath deserved to be whipt, and be favourable for his own sake. When the Boys, who learn the Greek Poets find such Words, as are not agreeable to the common Rules of Grammar, it is sufficient to say, that it is *Ionice* or *Doricè*, &c. And whenever they make false Exercise, or whenever they mistake an Author's Meaning through Ignorance, or pervert it through Wilfulness, they may excuse themselves, and say, it is *Catcotticè*.

Secondly, As I think, that I have found out the Cause, which this Author is defending, namely, the Study of the Hebrew Scriptures; which he mentions in the Beginning of his Sermon; so I heartily join with him, and wish it good Success, as one of the best Means to promote *Christian Knowledge*, and the most useful Learning among us. In such a Case the ignorant Perverters of the sacred Text, under pretence of Skill that Way, would not be so forward to publish their Opinions to the World, and might more easily be confuted. I shall be glad, if what I have offered can any Way be serviceable to the same Cause; but I am troubled to think, that the Author's Management of it can do it but little Service.

But, if the Cause, which the Author is defending may be learned from the Title, viz. *The supreme and inferior ELOHIM*, then his Meaning must be, That the sacred Trinity is the supreme Being, which we call GOD; and that Princes and Magistrates are called Gods in an inferior Manner, as particularly in his Text, *Psal.*
lxxxii,

lxxxii. 6. The first Part hereof is fully proved in this Century, by the most able Divines of the *Church of England*. And he needed not to be at so much Pains to defend the latter Part, because it was never denied. Our SAVIOUR's Quotation of this Text in ^r the *New Testament*, which our Author hath omitted, and his applying it in this Manner, is more to the Purpose, than all the Arguments, which this Author hath produced, and he might have contented himself with that, and the common Arguments used by others, without confounding the World by such a perplexed and unintelligible Discourse, to say no worse of it.

Or, if the Cause, which the Author is *defending*, is ^h that Mr. *Hutchinson* was the first, who since *Inspiration* ceased, began to recover the true Sense of the *Hebrew Scriptures*, he ought then to bestir himself in good earnest. Men will hardly be obliged to take him for the most learned Divine, who ever came since into the World, or to follow him, as the *Turks* follow *Mahomet* for the greatest Prophet and Apostle, unless as *Mahomet* did, they carry their Cause by Force of Arms instead of Arguments. However, I think, he cannot prove it from the Text, nor from any other Passage of *Scripture*, which ought to be the Foundation of all Discourses from the Pulpit, and ⁱ the Cause is of such a Nature, that he will have a difficult Task to defend it.

I shall conclude all with one Observation more. This Author saith, ^k He shall bless GOD to his dying Day, that his good Providence ever brought him acquainted with Mr. *Hutchinson's Works* and

^r *John* x. 34, 35.
ⁱ Page 16.

^k Page 37.

^h Compare pag. 15. with pag. 38.

Person. This I heartily wish: GOD's Providence can bring good out of Evil. And *St. Peter's* Fall was the Occasion of his future Advantage. But then he must repent as *St. Peter* did; and be converted, as *St. Peter* was. *St. Peter* wept bitterly, because he had denied CHRIST; and this Author should weep as bitterly, because he hath blasphemed the sacred Name JEHOVAH. *Know thy self*, is an excellent Saying; and I hope, that the *Author* will practise it for the Future. Humility is one of the principal Virtues. And this *Author* cannot have too mean an Opinion of his own Parts or Performances. Let him consider, that though he hath a strong natural Inclination to be the Head of a Sect; yet such Passions ought to be corrected and suppressed, and he hath neither Learning nor Brains sufficient for such an Undertaking. He who cannot make a good under Spir Leather, will never be able to set up in the Trade. Let him apply himself to the Study of the sound and solid Divines of the *Church of England*, who have had an Education for that Purpose from their Youth, have applied themselves to understand her Doctrines ever since, and have had Time and Opportunities for making a much greater Progress in Learning; and not take up with any Person, as the only Oracle, who was never bred up to it, and is daily hindered by a secular Employment. I own, that the *Trinity in Unity*, the *Incarnation of the Son of GOD*, the Covenant from all Eternity to redeem lost Man, and the Execution of it by CHRIST JESUS as our Mediator, and the Duties arising from thence, which we owe to GOD for such an infinite Mercy, are great and noble Truths. They are the fundamental

Doctrines of our holy Religion, and such as cannot be preached upon too often at any Time, but especially in this Age. But then they should be so preached, that every one may understand them; and be proved by such Arguments, as are liable to no Exceptions. I shall recommend to the Author that excellent Saying ^m of St. Paul, *If there be any Consolation in CHRIST, if any Comfort of Love, if any Fellowship of the Spirit, if any Bowels and Mercies; let nothing be done through Strife or vain Glory, but in Lowliness of Mind let each esteem other better than themselves.* I beg also that he would often think upon the Words of his own Sermon (which I shall repeat, because they are intelligible) and apply them to himself. ⁿ *A Man cannot keep in his struggling Indignation to see the divine Oracles thus misapplied or misinterpreted, through Ignorance or Malice or both. But thus it must be, whilst illiterate and conceited Men presume to quote Writings, which they cannot read, reason about things, whereof they have no Ideas, and give Judgment in Cases, where they do not see one Tittle of the Evidence. The best, that can be said in their Excuse is, that they know not what they are doing. But I wish, they would consider in due Time, whether when CHRIST (the Person whom they are opposing, and who should have been their Saviour) shall, at the last Day, call them to a sad Account for all the dreadful Consequences of all their pernicious Doctrines; I say, I wish they would consider, whether at that Time Ignorance can be deemed a tolerable Excuse in the Mouths of those, who took upon them to be Teachers of others.* This I hope will be an Excuse,

^m Phil. ii. 1, 3.ⁿ Page 33.

for any thing, which may otherwise seem too severe or satyrical in the foregoing Discourse.

If he will be pleased to take my Advice, with fervent Prayer to GOD for the Assistance of his Spirit, and with that Humility, Seriousness and Desire to be better informed, as a Christian ought to have, *he may bless GOD to his dying Day, that the Divine Providence brought him acquainted with Mr. Hutchinson's Works, by which Means he also had the Perusal of these Observations on his Sermon.*

24 OC 64

F I N I S.
